arXiv:astro-ph/0106024v1 1 Jun 2001

Intensity Distributions of Gamma-Ray Bursts

David L. Band

X-2, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545 USA

Abstract. Observations of individual bursts chosen by the vagaries of telescope availability demonstrated that bursts are *not* standard candles and that their apparent energy can be as great as 10^{54} erg. However, determining the distribution of their apparent energy (and of other burst properties) requires the statistical analysis of a well-defined burst sample; the sample definition includes the threshold for including a burst in the sample. Thus optical groups need to the criteria behind the decision to search for a spectroscopic redshift. Currently the burst samples are insufficient to choose between lognormal and power law functional forms of the distribution, and the parameter values for these functional forms differ between burst samples. Similarly, the actual intensity distribution may be broader than observed, with a low energy tail extending below the detection threshold.

INTRODUCTION

Major advances in the study of gamma-ray bursts have resulted both from the construction and analysis of carefully selected burst samples, and from fortuitous discoveries of key properties of individual bursts. The BATSE burst sample, with precisely defined detection thresholds, showed that the peak flux distribution and the isotropic angular distribution were inconsistent with an origin in the Galactic plane[9] and marginally inconsistent with a Galactic halo progenitor population, and thus before 1997 most of the burst community concluded by a process of elimination that bursts occur at cosmological distances. On the other hand, beginning in 1997 the arcsecond localization of a few bursts coincident with faint galaxies became the definitive confirmation that bursts are indeed a cosmological phenomenon; these bursts were chosen largely on the basis of the available telescopes and the willingness of observers with access to these telescopes to devote their precious observing time to following these bursts. (Note that the possibility still remains that some bursts—such as bursts with durations under ~ 1 s—originate from less distant sources.) Thus some of the major advances in the study of bursts have resulted from the statistical analysis of well-constructed burst samples, while others (often the more spectacular breakthroughs) have followed observations of individual bursts selected through the vagaries of the available telescopes. Here I discuss the interplay of statistical analysis and serendipitous discovery in the determination of bursts' intrinsic intensity. I argue that observations of individual bursts established the qualitative characteristics of burst intensities but that determining the quantitative properties requires well-defined criteria for choosing the bursts which should be studied. In particular, a multi-wavelength effort involving different telescopes is required for determining properties such as a burst's intensity and redshift: an X-ray burst detector (e.g., *Beppo-Sax*'s Wide Field Camera) first localizes the burst to ~ 3 arcminute; an X-ray telescope (e.g., *Beppo-Sax*'s Narrow Field Instrument) then localizes the afterglow to about

an arcminute; an imaging optical telescope localizes the optical afterglow to less than an arcsecond; and finally, optical spectroscopy determines the burst redshift through the detection of either absorption lines in the afterglow spectrum or emission lines from the host galaxy. The most restrictive intensity threshold for mounting any component of this campaign must be defined and reported to construct a well-defined statistical sample.

CONSTANT CANDLE BURSTS

After the statistical analysis of the BATSE peak flux and spatial distributions favored a cosmological origin, the burst community by and large adopted the "minimal cosmological model"[2] wherein bursts were standard candles and the shape of the intensity distribution (e.g., for the peak photon flux) resulted from the cosmological curvature of space. Although this paradigm was expected to be overly simplistic, it was the basis for Schaefer's conclusion[11] that the predicted host galaxies were missing from the best burst localizations then available. Schaefer's assertion was contested[8], but the statistical analysis of Band and Hartmann[2] verified that the *expected* host galaxies were indeed absent. Band and Hartmann considered the galaxy detection thresholds in each burst error box as well as the presence of the host and unrelated background galaxies. However, testing the cosmological paradigm which motivated Schaefer's search for the host galaxies became moot with the observed coincidence of *faint* galaxies with afterglows localized to an arcsecond. As Schaefer had reported, and Band and Hartmann corroborated, the minimal cosmological model was indeed incorrect, not because bursts are not cosmological, but because the model was too "minimal:" the deviation of the cumulative intensity distribution from the $-3/2$ power law expected for a homogeneous population in three-dimensional Euclidean space does not result solely from the cosmological curvature of space, and bursts are farther than derived by the minimal model. Band, Hartmann and Schaefer[3] used the statistical methodology of Band and Hartmann to find the burst energy for which the host galaxy detections (or upper limits) were consistent with the expected galaxy luminosity function. They found a standard candle total burst energy of $\sim 10^{53}$ erg. The observed redshifts and energy fluences did give some burst energies of this magnitude; however, because a range of burst energies spanning ~ 3 decades was observed, these observations also demonstrated that bursts are *not* standard candles in terms of the apparent total energy.

Thus the statistical analyses of Band and Hartmann[2] and Band, Hartmann and Schaefer[3] were appropriate for answering questions such as whether the minimal cosmological model was valid and what is the standard candle energy. However, these questions are answered more directly by a few observations of randomly selected bursts: only two bursts with significantly different energies demonstrate that bursts are not standard candles; only one bright burst with a faint host galaxy (or with $z > 1$) shows that the intensity distribution cannot be explained solely by cosmological curvature; and a few burst energies give the typical energy scale.

THE INTENSITY DISTRIBUTION

What is the distribution of the total energy emitted by a gamma-ray burst? We only observe the energy emitted in our direction, which can be expressed as the *apparent* total energy, the energy emitted if the burst actually radiated gamma-rays isotropically. The apparent total energy is the actual energy divided by the beaming fraction, the fraction of the sky into which the gamma-rays are actually emitted; both the total energy and the beaming fraction are relevant for understanding burst physics. Indeed, Frail *et al.*[6] calculated the beaming fraction for a burst sample based on afterglow evolution, and found a narrow distribution of the total energy centered around 10^{51} erg.

Different measures of burst intensity have been used, such as the peak energy luminosity, the total gamma-ray energy, the peak photon flux, the total number of photons emitted, or the total afterglow energy. Note that bursts can be standard candles for at most one of these intensity measures. The intensity measure studied is a matter of theoretical prejudice and ease of calculation (the data may not be available to calculate some measures). Many studies have used the peak photon flux because burst detectors, such as BATSE, trigger on the peak count rate, and consequently the detection threshold for the peak flux is fairly sharp. However, I prefer the total energy emitted; the observable is a burst's energy fluence. In the current theoretical scenario (see Piran[10] for a review of current burst theories) the gamma-ray emission results from internal shocks when regions in a relativistic outflow with different Lorentz factors collide. The total gamma-ray energy emitted should be related to the energy of the outflow while the peak luminosity is a consequence of a particular internal shock, which will result from the burst-specific distribution of Lorentz factors within the outflow. Thus I suspect that the emitted total energy is fairly representative of the energy released while the peak luminosity is more contingent on the details of the energy release.

In studying the burst intensity distribution, my collaborators and I have assumed specific functional forms. Thus Jimenez, Band and Piran[7] fit lognormal distributions to the total apparent energy, the peak gamma-ray luminosity, and the total X-ray afterglow energy, while recently I fit both lognormal and simple power law distributions to the total apparent energy.[1] When normalized to unity, these distributions are the probability $p(I)$ that a burst has a given intensity I. However, the probability $p_{\rm obs}(I)$ of *observing* a burst with a given intensity is that part of the intensity distribution above the threshold for including the burst in our sample. For example, a high redshift burst will be detected, and thus included in our sample, only if it was drawn from the high end of the intensity distribution. In both studies likelihood functions were constructed from the probabilities $p_{\rm obs}(I)$ of obtaining each member of the sample. The parameters of the distribution function were determined by maximizing the likelihood, and the parameters' confidence ranges were determined by integrating over the likelihood surface.

These studies considered different burst samples. Both Jimenez *et al.*[7] and my recent study[1] used a sample of 9 bursts with spectroscopic redshifts and BATSE spectra. The energy fluences were calculated by fitting the GRB spectral function[4] to the BATSE spectra, and then integrating the fits over the 20–2000 keV energy band and the burst duration. In my study[1] I also considered the 17 burst sample of Frail *et al.*[6] which adds bursts observed by *Beppo-SAX*, *Ulysses*, KONUS and *NEAR* to the 9 BATSE bursts. For these two samples the detection thresholds are unknown since the criteria for

attempting to localize the bursts and determine their redshifts have not been reported. Finally, in my study I used the 220 BATSE bursts with redshifts determined through the conjectured correlation between light curve variability and peak burst luminosity[5]; this sample has a well-defined threshold for including a burst.

Jimenez *et al.*[7] extended their sample of bursts with spectroscopic redshifts by including bursts with only a host galaxy magnitude. A redshift probability distribution can be derived from a host galaxy magnitude using an empirical galaxy redshift distribution and assuming a model for the rate at which bursts occur in galaxies. Galaxy surveys such as the Hubble Deep Field weight each detected galaxy equally, yet in most burst scenarios bursts occur preferentially in massive or luminous galaxies. Jimenez *et al.* tested various weighting schemes using a sample of 10 bursts with both host galaxy magnitudes and spectroscopic redshifts. The test consisted of calculating a likelihood using the redshift probability distributions evaluated at the observed spectroscopic redshifts. The redshift probability distribution used in this test should be modified to include only the redshift range over which the observations could have determined the redshift: one of the few spectral lines detectable in the spectra of faint galaxies must have been redshifted into the telescope's bandpass. Once again a detection threshold is required for the statistical analysis of a burst sample. We found that weighting the empirical galaxy redshift distribution (derived from the Hubble Deep Field) by the host galaxy's luminosity at the time of the burst was favored. This result is relevant to progenitor scenarios (e.g., the galaxy luminosity for $z > 1$ may be proportional to the star formation rate, consistent with the progenitors being massive, short-lived stars), although a proper analysis requires sophisticated modeling of a galaxy's luminosity history.

In my study of the burst energy[1] I found that the lognormal and power law distribution functions are both acceptable descriptions of the data because the average of the cumulative probability is consistent with the expected value of 1/2 within the uncertainty resulting from the sample size. The Bayesian odds ratio demonstrated that neither function was favored over the other (odds ratio of ~ 1) for the two small burst samples with spectroscopic redshifts, but the lognormal function is favored (odds ratio of $\sim 10^4$) for the large sample with redshifts derived from the variability-luminosity correlation. The three samples give significantly different best-fit parameter values, which may result from the small sample sizes, the poorly determined detection thresholds for the spectroscopic redshift samples, and the uncertain validity of the variability-luminosity correlation. For example, for the central energy of the lognormal distribution I find: $E_0 = 1.3 \times 10^{53}$ erg (with a 90% confidence range of 0.016–3.2$\times 10^{53}$ erg) for the 9 burst BATSE sample; $E_0 = 5.2 \times 10^{53}$ erg (0.016–1.0$\times 10^{53}$ erg 90% confidence range) for the 17 burst Frail *et al.*[6] sample; and $E_0 = 0.12 \times 10^{53}$ erg (0.02–0.23$\times 10^{53}$ erg 90% confidence range) for the 220 burst variability-luminosity[5] sample. For all three samples the logarithmic width is nearly the same (the standard deviation of $\ln E$ is ~ 2).

The likelihood contours for the 2 parameters of the lognormal distribution have a ridge of high likelihood running from the peak towards lower central energy E_0 and larger logarithmic width σ. Similarly, the low energy cutoff for a simple power law cannot be determined—we only know that it is below the lowest energy observed. Thus for both distribution functions the likelihood does not rule out the possibility that the actual energy distribution is wider than observed, with the low end unobservable because of the detection threshold. Only a larger burst sample sensitive to fainter bursts will determine

the extent of the actual energy distribution function.

Implicit in this statistical methodology are assumptions about the burst sample. I assume that the energy distribution does not evolve with redshift; this can eventually be tested by subdividing a larger sample. Further, I assume that there is no correlation between a burst's energy and the ability to determine its redshift; a burst's intrinsic intensity is assumed to be unrelated to environmental factors which promote or suppress the afterglow necessary to localize the burst.

As mentioned above, an accurate determination of the energy distribution requires the fluence threshold for including a burst in the sample. In general, the statistical determination of a burst property's distribution requires an understanding of the thresholds for all observational steps. In the case of the energy distribution, the most restrictive threshold is the determination of the redshift. A decision was made that: a) the burst was bright enough to attempt an afterglow detection; b) the afterglow was sufficiently well-localized to find a host galaxy; and c) the afterglow or the host galaxy are bright enough for spectroscopic observations. Thus, clear criteria are needed for the systematic ground-based observations which will follow-up the large number of well-localized bursts anticipated from *HETE-II* and *SWIFT*. Only with an understanding of the detection thresholds will burst property distributions be determined quantitatively.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Dieter Hartmann for his comments on this paper. This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by the Los Alamos National Laboratory under Contract No. W-7405-Eng-36.

REFERENCES

1. Band, D. L., *Ap. J.*, submitted, (2001).
2. Band, D. L., and Hartmann, D. H., *Ap. J.* **493**, 555–562 (1998).
3. Band, D. L., Hartmann, D. H., and Schaefer, B. E., *Ap. J.* **514**, 862–868 (1998).
4. Band, D., Matteson, J., Schaefer, B., Teegarden, B., Cline, T., Paciesas, W., Pendleton, G., Fishman, G., Meegan, C., Wilson, R., and Lestrade, P., *Ap. J.* **413**, 281–292 (1993).
5. Fenimore, E., and Ramirez-Ruiz, E., *Ap. J.*, in press (2001).
6. Frail, D., *et al.*, *Nature*, submitted (2001).
7. Jimenez, R., Band, D., Piran T., *Ap. J.*, in press (2001).
8. Larson, S. B., McLean, I. S., and Becklin, E. E., *Ap. J. Lett.* **460**, L95–97 (1996).
9. Meegan, C., *et al.*, *Nature* **355**, 143-145 (1992).
10. Piran, T., *Phys. Rep.* **333**, 529–553 (2000).
11. Schaefer, B., in *Gamma-Ray Bursts: Observations, Analyses and Theories*, ed. C. Ho, R. I. Epstein, and E. E. Fenimore (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 107-110 (1992).